

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
GRIFFEN SECURITY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

- against -

CITADEL CAR ALARMS, LLC,

Defendant.
-----X

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 7/6/2020

19-cv-3494 (VSB) (GWG)

ORDER

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Griffen Security, LLC (“Griffen”) brought this action alleging breach of a license agreement by defendant Citadel Car Alarms, LLC (“Citadel”), and four individual defendants who have since settled. On November 19, 2019, I entered default judgment against defendant Citadel, (Doc. 54), and on January 2, 2020, I referred this case to Magistrate Judge Gabriel W. Gorenstein for an inquest on damages, (Doc. 59). Before me is Magistrate Judge Gorenstein’s unchallenged Report and Recommendation, which recommends entry of judgment in favor of Griffen in the amount of \$42,670.32. (Doc. 66, “Report”.) The Report is thorough and detailed, and I accept its findings and recommendations, and enter judgment in favor of Griffen consistent with the Report.

In reviewing a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Parties may raise specific, written objections to the report and recommendation within 14 days of being served with a copy of the report. *Id.*; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). When a party submits a timely objection, a district court reviews de novo the parts of the report and recommendation to which the party objected. 28 U.S.C.


§ 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). When neither party submits an objection to a report and recommendation, or any portion thereof, a district court reviews the report and recommendation for clear error. *Santana v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 17-CV-2648 (VSB) (BCM), 2019 WL 2326214, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2019); *Marte v. Berryhill*, No. 17-CV-3567 (VSB) (JLC), 2018 WL 5255170, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 22, 2018); *Lewis v. Zon*, 573 F. Supp. 2d 804, 811 (S.D.N.Y. 2008); *Wilds v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

Here, although the Report explicitly provided that “the parties have fourteen (14) days (including weekends and holidays) from service of this Report and Recommendation to file any objections” (Report 13), neither party filed an objection. I therefore reviewed Judge Gorenstein’s thorough and well-reasoned Report and Recommendation for clear error and, after careful review, found none. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against defendant Citadel in the amount of \$42,670.32. The Clerk is further directed to close this case, and to mail a copy of this Order to Defendant Citadel at the address listed in Document 68.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 6, 2020
New York, New York


Vernon S. Broderick
United States District Judge